

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 17-21 and 23-29 are present in this application. By this Amendment, the Abstract of the Disclosure, the specification and claims 17-21 and 23-27 have been amended. Claims 1-16 and 22 have been canceled, and claims 28 and 29 have been added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **Information Disclosure Statements**

Applicants filed an Information Disclosure Statement along with a Form PTO/SB/08 (copy enclosed, along with a copy of the date-stamped receipt postcard) and three foreign references on September 4, 2007. Applicants have not yet received a copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 with the Examiner's initials and signature indicating the Examiner's consideration of the cited references. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to initial and sign the Form PTO/SB/08 and return the same to Applicants' representative along with the next communication from the Patent Office.

Also, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner initial the "Other" reference listed on Form PTO/SB/08 filed with an Information Disclosure Statement on October 17, 2005 and return a fully initialed copy to Applicants' representative along with the next communication from the Patent Office.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 14, 15 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 14 and 15 have been canceled, and claim 27 has been amended to define a program "stored on a computer-readable medium and executable by a computer processor" (claim 26 has been similarly amended). Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's suggestion with appreciation. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejections Over Prior Art

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,671,618 to Hoisko. Without conceding this rejection, claims 1-15 have been canceled. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 16-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hoisko in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0204840 to Hashima et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hoisko discloses a navigation system that provides a “tactile navigation stimulus” for a user. Hoisko describes that such stimulus may be in the form of vibration, heat, electric shock or pressure. The Hoisko patent endeavors to solve a problem with prior navigation systems that require the user to see or hear the device. Hoisko provides the navigation “stimulus” so that the user does not need to have visible or audio contact with the navigation aid. See col. 3, lines 20-22. Hoisko further describes that with a vibrating stimulus, “the vibration generated by the vibrating mobile device 2 can be used to alert the user if he/she is heading towards a wrong direction and/or is in a wrong path of movement. In a simple form of operation a vibrating mobile station 2 works as an indication that it is time to consult a map, or take some other measures to correct and/or check the direction of movement.” See col. 3, lines 56-62. Hoisko further describes its controller device 14 as providing the user with “unobtrusive gaze-free navigational aid.” See col. 6, lines 49-50. See also col. 8, line 67 – col. 9, line 7.

In contrast with the Hoisko system, according to at least one preferred feature of the claimed invention, the claimed pedestrian navigation device generates a vibration guide based on a user’s present position and, only after a predetermined delay from the time vibration guide is generated, outputs a guide voice based on the present position information. With this system, a

user is not required to memorize multiple vibration patterns, but can still use the device without requiring the device to be held in the user's hand, or within view, or within hearing range. Rather, the system alerts the user that a navigational signal or update is forthcoming, and after a predetermined delay provides additional output such as voice guide output to the user. The system thus gets the user's attention and enables the user to view or hear the device prior to providing the navigation instruction or update. The Hoisko system does not in any manner incorporate any such predetermined delay. In fact, with reference to the passages in Hoisko identified above, Hoisko actually teaches away from such delay as it directly contrasts Hoisko's primary goal of providing a "gaze-free navigational aid."

The Office Action recognizes that Hoisko additionally lacks the claimed voice guide output means. In this context, however, the Office Action contends that such voice guide output means is known in Hashima. Hashima discloses a navigation system that is adaptable for use in guiding a vehicle and a pedestrian. In the pedestrian operating mode, pathways not passable by vehicle are provided to the user. Additionally, the system includes means for detecting whether the device is being used in vehicle mode or pedestrian mode. The Hashima publication, however, does not correct the deficiencies noted above with regard to Hoisko. That is, Hashima similarly lacks a teaching or suggestion of structure or methodology that provides voice guide output only after a predetermined delay after a vibration guide.

Claim 17 defines vibrating means that generates a vibration guide based on the present position information calculated by the central processing means, and voice guide output means that outputs a guide voice based on the present position information calculated by the central processing means, wherein the voice guide output means outputs the guide voice after a predetermined delay from the time the vibration guide is generated. Claim 23 defines a related

navigation method, including a step of outputting a guide voice based on the calculated present position information after a predetermined delay from the time the vibration is generated. Since at least this subject matter is lacking in Hoisko and Hashima as discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is misplaced.

With regard to the dependent claims, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

#### New Claims

Claims 28 and 29 have been added and recite that the predetermined delay is selectable by the user. Support for this subject matter can be found in the specification at, for example, page 25, lines 8-12.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

OHNISHI et al.  
Appl. No. 10/553,325  
February 2, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:           /Alan M. Kagen/            
          Alan M. Kagen  
          Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100